

AUS20010333US1
M/S AF**REMARKS**Allowable Subject Matter

The Office Action advises that claims 8, 12, 13, 22, 26, 27, 36, 40, and 41 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims and further rewritten to overcome the objections to claims 1, 15, and 29 respectively. The Office Action further advises that the reason for the indication of allowable subject matter with respect to claims 8, 22, and 36 is "the travel server validating travel described in travel records against admission rules stored in admission rules databases ..." The Office Action further advises that the reason for the indication of allowable subject matter with respect to claims 12, 13, 26, 27, 40, and 41 is "reporting to the traveler through an internet-enabled device a result of the comparison ..." The Office Action also states, "Moreover, it would be advisable to recite explicitly that the travel server is external to the destination country's immigration authority, to whose database the travel server submits the admission form, so that the independent claims could not be read as describing the operations of an immigration authority's computer system."

In response, Applicants have carefully included in the independent claims the limitations regarding the travel server and the travel server separate from the immigration authority computer system as advised by the Examiner in the Office Action. Applicants acknowledge with gratitude the Examiner's helpfulness in this regard. In a response to the earlier Office Action dated September 29, 2004, Applicants amended the claims in the present application as set forth above in this Response by incorporating into independent claims 1, 15, and 29 elements corresponding to the reasons for allowable subject matter from claims 8, 22, and 36. Making claims 12, 13, 26, 27, 40, and 41 dependent from claims 1, 15, and 29 respectively, as is done by the above amendments, eliminates any need to rewrite them separately as independent claims – because they now depend from allowable independent claims.

AUS20010333US1
M/S AF

The Office Action objects to claims 29-42 as having a non-preferred form for computer program product claims. The Office Action describes the preferred claim form for computer program products on page 2 of the Office Action, and Applicants in this Response have amended claims 29-42 accordingly.

Applicants respectfully propose that these amendments place the claims in condition for allowance in accordance with the advice of the Office Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-7, 9-11, and 14 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vandyk ("No Entry") in view of official notice. Claims 15-21, 23-25, 28-35, 37-39, and 42 stand rejected for obviousness under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vandyk ("No Entry") in view of official notice and Crandall, *et al.* (Publication No. US 2002/0109647 A1). In response, Applicants have amended the claims in the present application as noted above by incorporating into independent claims 1, 15, and 29 the elements corresponding to the reason for allowable subject matter from claims 8, 22, and 36 – thereby rendering independent claims 1, 15, and 39 allowable. Applicants respectfully propose that the independent claims are allowable, and all the claims depending from the independent claims therefore are now allowable.

Conclusion

Claims 1-42 stand rejected for obviousness or objected to as depending from a rejected base claim. In response, Applicants have amended the claims in the present application as set forth above in this Response by incorporating into independent claims 1, 15, and 29 from claims 8, 22, and 36 elements corresponding to reasons for allowable subject matter – thereby rendering the independent claims allowable – and therefore also rendering all claims depending from them allowable also. The rejections of and objections to claims 1-

AUS20010333US1

M/S AF

42 should therefore be withdrawn, and the claims should be allowed. Reconsideration of claims 1-42 in light of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge or credit Deposit Account No. 09-0447 for any fees required or overpaid.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 31, 2005

By: _____



John Biggers
Reg. No. 44,537
Biggers & Ohanian, LLP
504 Lavaca Street, Suite 970
Austin, Texas 78701
Tel. (512) 472-9881
Fax (512) 472-9887